Case5:12-cv-01425-PSG Document40 Filed07/03/13 Page1 of 6

1	JOSEPH H. AINLEY (SBN 141230) JHA LAW OFFICES		ATES DISTRICT		
2	28 North First Street, Suites 520-540 San Jose, CA 95113 Telephone: (408) 465-4518		S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S		
4	Facsimile: (408) 834-7630		IT IS SO ORDERED AS MODIFIED.		
5	DAVID A. LOWE (SBN: 178811) JOHN T. MULLAN (SBN: 221149)				
6	RUDY, EXELROD, ZIEFF & LOWE, LLP 351 California Street, Suite 700	Ó	Judge Paul S. Grewal		
7	San Francisco, CA 94104 Telephone: (415) 434-9800	•			
8	Facsimile: (415) 434-0513 Email: dal@rezlaw.com		DISTRICT OF CV		
9	Email: jtm@rezlaw.com				
10	Attorneys for Plaintiff RAYMOND VACA				
11 12					
13	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT				
14	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA				
15	RAYMOND VACA, individually, and on behalf of All Others Similarly Situated for	Case No.	5:12-cv-01425-PSG		
16	the Benefit of All with Common or General Interest,	CLASS A	ACTION		
17	Plaintiff,		SED ORDER GRANTING		
18	VS.		IINARY APPROVAL OF CLASS SETTLEMENT		
19	TIN, INC., dba TEMPLE-INLAND, INC.,				
20 21	and DOES 1-10, inclusive	Date: Time:	June 18, 2013 10:00 a.m.		
22	Defendants.	Before:	Magistrate Judge Paul Singh Grewal Courtroom 5 - 4th Floor		
23	,		Courtroom 5 - 4th 1 1001		
24					
25					
26					
27					
28					
		1			

Plaintiff's Unopposed Motion for Order Granting Preliminary Approval of Class Action Settlement came on for regularly scheduled hearing in this Court on June 18, 2013 at 10:00 a.m., before the Honorable Paul Singh Grewal in Courtroom 5 of this Court.

After consideration of this Motion, the pleadings and argument of counsel, supporting declarations and documents, the Stipulation and Settlement Agreement of Class Action and Individual Claims, and other papers and pleadings on file, the Court finds and determines pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23 that Plaintiff's Motion for Preliminary Approval should be **GRANTED**.

THE COURT FINDS:

- 1. To the extent defined in the Stipulation and Settlement Agreement of Class Action and Individual Claims (the "Agreement"), attached as Exhibit A herewith and incorporated by reference herein, the terms in this Order shall have the meanings set forth therein.
- 2. The Court has jurisdiction over the subject matter of this action, the Defendants and the Class.
- 3. The Court has determined that the Class Notice accurately informs all persons in the Class of all material elements of the proposed Settlement --- including the plan of distribution of the Settlement Payment, the application for an incentive award to the Named Plaintiff and the application for a fee and expense award to Class Counsel, --- constitutes the best notice practicable under the circumstances, constitutes valid, due and sufficient notice to all Class Members, and complies fully with Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the United States Constitution, and any other applicable laws. The Court hereby approves the form and content of the Class Notice, which is attached to the Agreement as Exhibit 1.
- 4. The Court hereby preliminarily approves the Settlement as fair, reasonable and adequate in all respects to the Class Members pursuant to Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.
- 5. The Settlement Class, for purposes of the proposed settlement only and with no other effect on this litigation or any other proceeding, including if the Agreement ultimately is not

4

5

6 7

8 9

10 11

12

13 14

15

16

17 18

19

20

22

21

24

23

25 26

27 28 approved or final judgment is not entered, is appropriate under Fed. R. Civ. P. 23 and related case law and is defined as follows:

> All persons who, according to IP's payroll records, worked as Corrugator or Converter Facilitators, Supervisors, Lead Men, or Working Foremen in a plant operated by TIN, Inc. dba Temple-Inland, Inc. in the state of California at any time between January 26, 2008 and the date of Preliminary Approval.

- 6. For purposes of the proposed settlement only, the Settlement Class, consisting of approximately 110 Class Members, is sufficiently numerous that joinder is not practicable.
- 7. For purposes of the proposed settlement only, the Class Members' claims all stem from the same source – their employment by Defendants as Corrugator or Converter Facilitators, Supervisors, Lead Men, or Working Foremen (collectively "Class Positions"), their classification as exempt employees, and their non-receipt of overtime wages for their overtime hours worked – and there are questions of law and fact common to the members of the Settlement Class. The questions of law and fact common to the members of the Settlement Class include:
 - Whether Defendants' policy and practice of classifying the Settlement Class Members as exempt from overtime entitlement and failing to pay overtime to the Settlement Class members violates applicable law, including applicable statutory and regulatory authority; and
 - Whether Defendants unlawfully failed to pay compensation to Settlement Class Members for missed meal and rest periods in violation of the UCL and applicable California wage and hour laws; and
 - Whether Defendants unlawfully failed to keep and furnish Settlement Class Members with records of hours worked, in violation of applicable law.

As Plaintiff need only establish one common question of law or fact in order to meet the low threshold set by Rule 23(a)(2), Plaintiff's above showing of common issues satisfies what is required for settlement purposes.

- 8. For purposes of the proposed settlement only, the proposed Class Representative's claims are typical of those of the Class that he seeks to represent because the Class Members' claims all arise out of Defendants' uniform policy of classifying Class Positions as exempt, and of refusing to pay them overtime compensation for overtime hours worked.
- 9. For purposes of the proposed settlement only, the proposed Class Representative has fairly and adequately protected the interests of the Settlement Class. He has retained counsel

25

26

27

28

who have the experience and resources necessary to provide adequate representation of the Classes and meet the requirements of Rule 23(g)(1) for settlement purposes.

- 10. For purposes of the proposed settlement only, the Class Action Settlement and Plan of Distribution ("Proposed Settlement") is preliminarily approved as follows:
 - "Authorized Claimants" shares of the Net Settlement Fund, shall be calculated *pro rata* based on their weeks worked during the class period.
 - Authorized Claimants who worked in a Class Position during the PAGA Period will each receive an additional lump sum payment as their share of the \$2,500 of the Net Settlement Fund which is attributable to PAGA claims. The individual lump sum payments will be determined by dividing the \$2,500 by the total number of Authorized Claimants who worked in a Class Position during the PAGA Period.
 - Any amount remaining in the Settlement Fund after distribution to the members of the Settlement Class as set forth above based upon the agreed upon formula (for example due to settlement checks returned undeliverable or the failure of Settlement Class Members to negotiate settlement checks), if less than 25% of the Net Settlement Fund, will be divided equally and paid as a cy pres charitable contribution to the International Paper Employee Relief Fund and the Legal Aid Society of Santa Clara County. If the residual amount exceeds 25% of the Net Settlement Fund, the Settlement Administrator shall proceed with a second distribution to the Settlement Class.
- 11. For purposes of the proposed settlement only, the proposed incentive award of \$5,000 to the Named Plaintiff is fair and reasonable in recognition of his time and effort expended on behalf of the Settlement Class.
- 12. Plaintiff Counsel's (Class Counsel's) claims for the reasonable fee and expense award will be resolved at the time of the Final Approval hearing.
- 13. For purposes of the proposed settlement only, the proposed settlement administrators are experienced and the proposed limit of \$30,000 for settlement administration services is reasonable in light of the administration of the Proposed Class Settlement.

In light of the foregoing and good cause appearing, the Court **GRANTS**:

(1) Provisional Certification of the Proposed Settlement Class described as: "all persons who, according to IP's payroll records, worked as Corrugator or Converter Facilitators, Supervisors, Lead Men, or Working Foremen in a plant operated by

TIN, Inc. dba Temple-Inland, Inc. in the state of California at any time between January 26, 2008 and the date of Preliminary Approval."

- (2) Preliminary Approval of the Settlement and plan of distribution.
- (3) Preliminary Approval of the proposed incentive award of \$5,000 to the Named

 Plaintiff in recognition of his time and effort expended on behalf of the Settlement

 Class.
- (4) Preliminary Approval of the proposed settlement administrator.
- (5) Preliminary Approval of an amount not to exceed \$30,000 for settlement administration services.
- (6) Preliminary Approval of distribution of the Settlement Notice pursuant to the terms set forth in the Agreement.
- (7) Preliminary approval of the following Schedule for Final Approval of the Settlement:

Date	Action
June 18, 2013 July 2, 2013	Preliminary Approval Hearing
Within 30 days after preliminary approval is	Defendants will provide information to Class
granted	Counsel and the Settlement Administrator
Within 45 days after preliminary approval is	Settlement Administrator will mail Class
granted	Notice and Claim Form to the Class Members
Within 95 days after preliminary approval is	Class Counsel will move for award of
granted	reasonable attorneys' fees and costs and class
	representative service payment
Within 105 days after preliminary approval is	Deadline to return Claim Forms, opt-out,
granted	comment on or object to Settlement
Within 115 days after preliminary approval is	Class Counsel will move for final approval of
granted	Settlement

	Case5:12-cv-01425-PSG Document40	Filed07/03/13 Page6 of 6		
4				
1	投入来 December 10, 2013 at 10:00 a.m.	Final Settlement Approval Hearing/Fairness		
2	10.00 a.m.	Hearing		
3	Within 65 days after (a) service of notice of	"Payment Obligation and Class Release Date:"		
4	entry of the Final Approval Order, without any	Defendant to transfer settlement funds to		
5 6	appeals or requests for review, or (b) orders	Settlement Administrator		
7	affirming Final Approval Order or denying			
8	review			
9	Within 15 days after Payment Obligation and	Settlement Administrator to mail Class		
10	Class Release Date	Member settlement awards and to pay out fee		
11		and expense award, class representative service		
12		payment and PAGA Payment		
13				
14	(9) Should the Settlement Agreement not be finally approved, or should the Effective			
15	Date, as the term is defined in the Agreement, not occur, this Order shall be null and void and of			
16	no further force and effect, and the parties shall be restored to their respective positions prior to			
17	the execution of the Agreement. Upon such nullification, neither this Order nor the Agreement			
18	shall be used or referred to for any purpose in this action or in any other proceeding, and the			
19	Agreement and all negotiations thereto shall be inadmissible.			
20	IT IS SO ORDERED.			
21				
22	DATED: <u>July 3, 2013</u>	S. ALLE		
23		IE HONORABLE PAUL S. GREWAL ited States Magistrate Judge		
24				
25				
26				
27				
28				